

REMARKS - General

For the claim rejections as stated in the Final Office Action mailed on June 11, 2007, Applicant already stated the three reasons with detail explanations over the rejections in the Amendment A, mailed on December 27, 2006. Applicant again lists the three reasons to overcome the rejections in the Final Office Action as follows:

- (1) There are no justification, in Crochiere, et al., Tewfik, Fattouche, et al., Kim, et al., Graham, McClellan, Hudson, Harrison, Sklar, Van Nee, Claydon, and Umeda, or in any other prior arts separate from applicant's disclosure, which suggest that these references be individual or be combination way in the manner proposed.
- (2) Even if Crochiere, et al., Tewfik, Fattouche, et al., Kim, et al., Graham, McClellan, Hudson, Harrison, Sklar, Van Nee, Claydon, and Umeda were to be combined in the manner proposed, the proposed combination would not show all the novel physical features of the claims.
- (3) These novel physical features of the claims produce new and unexpected results in such a way that proposed spread spectrum based multichannel modulation for UWB Communications completely operates in the different methods and deals with different UWB signals in the different situations that Crochiere, et al., Tewfik, Fattouche, et al., Kim, et al., Graham, McClellan, Hudson, Harrison, Sklar, Van Nee, Claydon, and Umeda or any other prior arts suggested, and therefore are novelty, unobvious and patentable over these prior-art references.

Based on Examiner's requirements about the Allowable Subject Matter in the Final Office Action mailed on June 11, 2007, the Final Office Action stated "Claims 25 – 28, 46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.” Therefore, Applicant has currently amended the claims 25 – 32 and 46, and cancelled the claims 24 and 33 – 45.

Applicant has amended claims of the patent application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel physical feature structures, which are also unobvious. Patentable subject matters are clearly presented. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claims 25 – 32 and 46 now comply with Examiner’s requirements about the allowable subject matter and therefore requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. By the above amendment, this patent application is now in a full condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

This patent application is submitted that patentable subject matter is clearly present based on Examiner’s requirements about the Allowable Subject Matter in the Final Office Action (dated June 11, 2007). If, for any reason this patent application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions so that the undersigned can place this patent application in an allowable condition without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,



George J. Miao

----- Applicant Pro Se -----

20400 Via Pavisio, #A27

Cupertino, CA 95014

Tel. 408-865-1158



Certificate of Mailing. I hereby certify that this correspondence, if any, will be deposited with the United States Postal Service by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" on the date below.

Date: July 1, 2007

Inventor's Signature: George J. Miao